

JUL 11 2008

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JORGE ARCADIO CORONADO-  
AYALA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-74135

Agency No. A35-049-411

MEMORANDUM \*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 1, 2008\*\*

Before: WALLACE, HAWKINS and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Jorge Arcadio Coronado-Ayala petitions for review of the Board of  
Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order summarily affirming an immigration judge's

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent  
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without  
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“IJ”) order denying his application for relief under former section 212(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law in immigration proceedings, *Vasquez-Zavala v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 1105, 1107 (9th Cir. 2003), and we dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review Coronado-Ayala’s challenge to the IJ’s discretionary denial of a § 212(c) waiver. *See Vargas-Hernandez v. Gonzales*, 497 F.3d 919, 923 (9th Cir. 2007) (“Discretionary decisions, including whether or not to grant § 212(c) relief, are not reviewable. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii).”).

We reject Coronado-Ayala’s contention that the IJ improperly relied upon the police reports in the record in denying relief. *See Paredes-Urrestarazu v. INS*, 36 F.3d 801, 810 (9th Cir. 1994) (BIA may consider an alien’s past conduct that did not result in a conviction when making a § 212(c) determination).

Coronado-Ayala’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**